

## OPEN LETTER FROM CHURCH FEDERATION

To Mayor Sweeney and Chief of Police  
Clemans, in Response to  
Their Reply to  
FEDERATION'S RECENT EFFORT

To Have the Slot Machines Retired.  
Attack on the Reasons for  
Non-enforcement.

The long expected response from the  
Federation of Churches on the recent  
reply of Mayor Sweeney and Chief  
of Police Clemans to the Federation's re-  
quest that the city ordinances against  
gaming be enforced to the extent of re-  
tiring the slot machines, has been made  
public. The reply was handed to the  
Intelligencer last night by Rev. Dr. J.  
L. Sooy, of the Federation. In full it is  
as follows:

An open letter to the Mayor and Chief  
of Police of the City of Wheeling.

GENTLEMEN:—Your reply to the  
"statement" presented to you Decem-  
ber 5, was received. We have carefully  
considered the reasons which you give  
why you cannot grant our petition and  
enforce the laws and ordinances, and  
we are free to say that in our judg-  
ment your position is not supported,  
much less proven, by the facts you  
cite. Eliminating from the "reply" all  
advice so gratuitously given to par-  
ents, ministers and churchmen, and  
the principal reasons assigned by you  
why you do not enforce the laws, let  
us examine them in the light of  
facts.

1.—The failure to obtain justice in  
the criminal court.

In your "reply" you state that "re-  
verend" cases, upon which conviction has  
been had in the police court, "were ap-  
pealed to the criminal court." Now,  
upon examination of the records of the  
criminal court, we find that only two  
cases of appeal have been made upon  
during your administration. In all  
eleven cases of appeal are recorded as  
disposed of. Of these, three were set-  
tled by the parties themselves paying  
their fines before the appeals reached  
the upper court; and six were dismis-  
sed before the appeal was argued. Of  
the two cases of appeal tried, the evi-  
dence in one was "clearly insufficient,"  
and the action of the police court was  
properly reversed; the other case is  
the one to which you evidently refer  
when you say in your "reply" that it  
was "the one deemed the strongest,"  
and that it "was declared by the jury  
to be not guilty." We are sorry to  
be "not guilty" in this case was clear  
and sufficient against the party, and  
the decision of the police court should  
have been sustained. The upper court  
is of the same opinion, and, in the  
time in which your career, the  
judge of that court "lectured a jury for  
the verdict rendered."

This is the only case, however, in  
which you can claim justice was not  
done you in the criminal court. We do  
not understand, therefore, the assertion  
in your "reply" that "in many other in-  
stances of cases appealed from the de-  
cision of police court, where the evi-  
dence seemed to be against the party,  
the upper court did not sustain the  
city's case." The judge of that court  
informs us that only these two cases  
have ever been before that court, dur-  
ing your administration, and, an appeal  
from the decision of the police court.

Now, we submit this question: Is not  
this a slim basis on which to form the  
conviction, to which you say you ar-  
rived, viz., that "public sentiment is not  
in favor of extending the reforms."  
We ask, is this a slim basis for the  
reason that if you will remember your  
oaths of office, there is nothing said in  
them as to whether you are to have an  
option of withholding the discharge of  
your duty until the supreme court, or  
the results that may follow upon an  
appeal. If every case of appeal were  
to be reversed in the upper court, we  
submit that does not relieve the police  
court in the premises, and does not  
affect the discharge of your duty in the  
least. For if your position be a correct  
one, it would involve every inferior  
court in West Virginia from adminis-  
trating the law in view of the possi-  
bility of an appeal to the supreme court,  
even in the darkest days in the  
jurisprudence of England, ever  
had as broad a distinction as that.

Therefore, we cannot agree with you  
that your experience in these ap-  
peals is a conclusive proof that  
"public sentiment, as expressed  
through the jury box, is not in favor of  
the enforcement" of "present laws."  
Under other administrations, any such  
ground for complaint; neither was such  
complaint ever made. In any case, we  
believe the police court in our solemn  
obligation to perform its duty, what-  
ever may be the consequences of an  
appeal in the upper court.

2.—The failure to secure justice, in  
council, before the committee on pe-  
titions and remonstrances.

You state that you appeared before  
said committee, and entered objection  
to the issuance of licenses to persons  
who had not been previously present at  
the ordinance as expressed in section 18,  
of the ordinances in relation to coffee  
houses and ordinaries. We find that  
section imposes a fine upon any person  
keeping a coffee house or ordinary who  
has not been present at the ordinance  
to which he "shall suffer any rioting  
or drunkenness, or any public lewd-  
ness or obscenity," etc., at his place.

The records of the committee on pe-  
titions and remonstrances show that, on  
April 1, 1899, the mayor and chief of  
police did appear before said commit-  
tee, and did protest against the issue-  
ance of a license to two parties. The  
records of council, however, do not  
show that they had been previously  
present at the ordinance, and, at that  
same committee meeting, April 10, there  
were written protests and petitions of  
other parties against another place. These  
written documents were carried to the  
committee's report into council, and,  
having considered them in open ses-  
sion, council refused to license that  
place.

Now we are at a loss to know why the  
mayor and chief of police, who began  
so well, did not persevere and press  
their case before council as a body.  
Why give such undue weight, in your  
"reply," to the point made by the com-  
mittee on petitions and remonstrances,  
that "if applicants were refused, the  
revenues of the city would be reduced?"  
Why should that have alienated all  
official obligation, if, "acting upon the  
advice of competent counsel," as you  
state, you had seen in it "a strike at  
the root of the condition?" Would the  
cutting off of the licenses of two viola-  
tors of the law have bankrupted the  
city financially? The facts are, leading  
members of council inform us that  
that until recently, did they know that  
the mayor and chief of police had ever  
made any such protest. Again, we  
ask, why was not that protest made by  
council, and a hearing demanded? The  
mayor and chief had full liberty to  
do so; and, had they done so, unques-  
tionably their defense at this time  
would not be so utterly groundless,  
when they assume to state that "acting  
upon the advice of competent counsel" they

determined "to strike at the root of  
the condition."

3.—The question of revenue.

In your "reply" you make the asser-  
tion that "the police department was  
last year required to produce \$7,000  
from fines and fees in police court, a  
requirement surely not calculated to  
improve the moral welfare of the city."  
Permit us to call your attention espe-  
cially to the strong words used, "re-  
quired" and "requirement." Now we  
submit such is not the financial "poli-  
cy" of the city. There is no such "re-  
quirement." Never has been.

At the beginning of the fiscal year  
the joint standing committee on finance  
is in the habit of estimating the prob-  
able revenues of the city. It makes up  
the estimate from the income from  
various sources of revenue of the pre-  
vious years. The matter of fines and  
fees is not a "required" fixed amount,  
as you would have us believe. Fur-  
thermore, these fines and fees are not  
devoted to the regulation, running ex-  
penses of the city. They do not go to  
the expenses of the police department;  
neither are they included in the esti-  
mated running expenses of any other  
department. They are, by act of the  
legislature, turned over to the board of  
public works for improvements. Mem-  
bers of council, whom we have advised  
with—and we have consulted leading  
members of the joint standing commit-  
tee on finance—repute the idea that  
the city's policy is to raise revenue  
from "offenders of the class of which"  
we "complain," much less that "it is a  
part of the present financial structure  
of the city," as you assert. And know-  
ing what you do now, since your "re-  
ply" was printed, we prophesy you  
would not again fall into any such  
blunders at the expense of our city's  
reputation, both abroad and at home.

In conclusion, we would remind you  
that, on entering upon the duties of  
your respective offices, the way was  
clear for practical reform in this mat-  
ter of the slot machine. Ex-Mayor  
Butts had stopped them as one of his  
last official acts. Why were they not  
allowed to return again? Not only  
have they returned, but, as your re-  
cent raid for revenue proves, they have  
returned in greatly increased numbers.  
Furthermore, slot machines, like the  
class exhibiting the most obscene pic-  
tures, have come in very recently,  
which are violations of section 5, of  
"Offenses," which provides that it is  
unlawful for any person to publicly  
exhibit or cause to be exhibited, en-  
graving, print, sculpture, picture or  
representation within this city. And yet  
the violation of this ordinance is per-  
mitted daily by the operation of these  
obscene slot machines. Has this law  
been "declared unconstitutional" also?

Once more, therefore, we call upon  
you to perform your duties in the  
matter complained of in our former  
petition. We came to you, with  
the prayer only that you "en-  
force the law for the suppression of all  
slot machines in our city," and that you  
"take measures forthwith for  
granting the prayer of this petition."  
The upper court, in the case of the  
upper court, and six were dismis-  
sed before the appeal was argued. Of  
the two cases of appeal tried, the evi-  
dence in one was "clearly insufficient,"  
and the action of the police court was  
properly reversed; the other case is  
the one to which you evidently refer  
when you say in your "reply" that it  
was "the one deemed the strongest,"  
and that it "was declared by the jury  
to be not guilty." We are sorry to  
be "not guilty" in this case was clear  
and sufficient against the party, and  
the decision of the police court should  
have been sustained. The upper court  
is of the same opinion, and, in the  
time in which your career, the  
judge of that court "lectured a jury for  
the verdict rendered."

This is the only case, however, in  
which you can claim justice was not  
done you in the criminal court. We do  
not understand, therefore, the assertion  
in your "reply" that "in many other in-  
stances of cases appealed from the de-  
cision of police court, where the evi-  
dence seemed to be against the party,  
the upper court did not sustain the  
city's case." The judge of that court  
informs us that only these two cases  
have ever been before that court, dur-  
ing your administration, and, an appeal  
from the decision of the police court.

Now, we submit this question: Is not  
this a slim basis on which to form the  
conviction, to which you say you ar-  
rived, viz., that "public sentiment is not  
in favor of extending the reforms."  
We ask, is this a slim basis for the  
reason that if you will remember your  
oaths of office, there is nothing said in  
them as to whether you are to have an  
option of withholding the discharge of  
your duty until the supreme court, or  
the results that may follow upon an  
appeal. If every case of appeal were  
to be reversed in the upper court, we  
submit that does not relieve the police  
court in the premises, and does not  
affect the discharge of your duty in the  
least. For if your position be a correct  
one, it would involve every inferior  
court in West Virginia from adminis-  
trating the law in view of the possi-  
bility of an appeal to the supreme court,  
even in the darkest days in the  
jurisprudence of England, ever  
had as broad a distinction as that.

Therefore, we cannot agree with you  
that your experience in these ap-  
peals is a conclusive proof that  
"public sentiment, as expressed  
through the jury box, is not in favor of  
the enforcement" of "present laws."  
Under other administrations, any such  
ground for complaint; neither was such  
complaint ever made. In any case, we  
believe the police court in our solemn  
obligation to perform its duty, what-  
ever may be the consequences of an  
appeal in the upper court.

2.—The failure to secure justice, in  
council, before the committee on pe-  
titions and remonstrances.

You state that you appeared before  
said committee, and entered objection  
to the issuance of licenses to persons  
who had not been previously present at  
the ordinance as expressed in section 18,  
of the ordinances in relation to coffee  
houses and ordinaries. We find that  
section imposes a fine upon any person  
keeping a coffee house or ordinary who  
has not been present at the ordinance  
to which he "shall suffer any rioting  
or drunkenness, or any public lewd-  
ness or obscenity," etc., at his place.

The records of the committee on pe-  
titions and remonstrances show that, on  
April 1, 1899, the mayor and chief of  
police did appear before said commit-  
tee, and did protest against the issue-  
ance of a license to two parties. The  
records of council, however, do not  
show that they had been previously  
present at the ordinance, and, at that  
same committee meeting, April 10, there  
were written protests and petitions of  
other parties against another place. These  
written documents were carried to the  
committee's report into council, and,  
having considered them in open ses-  
sion, council refused to license that  
place.

Now we are at a loss to know why the  
mayor and chief of police, who began  
so well, did not persevere and press  
their case before council as a body.  
Why give such undue weight, in your  
"reply," to the point made by the com-  
mittee on petitions and remonstrances,  
that "if applicants were refused, the  
revenues of the city would be reduced?"  
Why should that have alienated all  
official obligation, if, "acting upon the  
advice of competent counsel," as you  
state, you had seen in it "a strike at  
the root of the condition?" Would the  
cutting off of the licenses of two viola-  
tors of the law have bankrupted the  
city financially? The facts are, leading  
members of council inform us that  
that until recently, did they know that  
the mayor and chief of police had ever  
made any such protest. Again, we  
ask, why was not that protest made by  
council, and a hearing demanded? The  
mayor and chief had full liberty to  
do so; and, had they done so, unques-  
tionably their defense at this time  
would not be so utterly groundless,  
when they assume to state that "acting  
upon the advice of competent counsel" they

determined "to strike at the root of  
the condition."

3.—The question of revenue.

In your "reply" you make the asser-  
tion that "the police department was  
last year required to produce \$7,000  
from fines and fees in police court, a  
requirement surely not calculated to  
improve the moral welfare of the city."  
Permit us to call your attention espe-  
cially to the strong words used, "re-  
quired" and "requirement." Now we  
submit such is not the financial "poli-  
cy" of the city. There is no such "re-  
quirement." Never has been.

At the beginning of the fiscal year  
the joint standing committee on finance  
is in the habit of estimating the prob-  
able revenues of the city. It makes up  
the estimate from the income from  
various sources of revenue of the pre-  
vious years. The matter of fines and  
fees is not a "required" fixed amount,  
as you would have us believe. Fur-  
thermore, these fines and fees are not  
devoted to the regulation, running ex-  
penses of the city. They do not go to  
the expenses of the police department;  
neither are they included in the esti-  
mated running expenses of any other  
department. They are, by act of the  
legislature, turned over to the board of  
public works for improvements. Mem-  
bers of council, whom we have advised  
with—and we have consulted leading  
members of the joint standing commit-  
tee on finance—repute the idea that  
the city's policy is to raise revenue  
from "offenders of the class of which"  
we "complain," much less that "it is a  
part of the present financial structure  
of the city," as you assert. And know-  
ing what you do now, since your "re-  
ply" was printed, we prophesy you  
would not again fall into any such  
blunders at the expense of our city's  
reputation, both abroad and at home.

In conclusion, we would remind you  
that, on entering upon the duties of  
your respective offices, the way was  
clear for practical reform in this mat-  
ter of the slot machine. Ex-Mayor  
Butts had stopped them as one of his  
last official acts. Why were they not  
allowed to return again? Not only  
have they returned, but, as your re-  
cent raid for revenue proves, they have  
returned in greatly increased numbers.  
Furthermore, slot machines, like the  
class exhibiting the most obscene pic-  
tures, have come in very recently,  
which are violations of section 5, of  
"Offenses," which provides that it is  
unlawful for any person to publicly  
exhibit or cause to be exhibited, en-  
graving, print, sculpture, picture or  
representation within this city. And yet  
the violation of this ordinance is per-  
mitted daily by the operation of these  
obscene slot machines. Has this law  
been "declared unconstitutional" also?

Once more, therefore, we call upon  
you to perform your duties in the  
matter complained of in our former  
petition. We came to you, with  
the prayer only that you "en-  
force the law for the suppression of all  
slot machines in our city," and that you  
"take measures forthwith for  
granting the prayer of this petition."  
The upper court, in the case of the  
upper court, and six were dismis-  
sed before the appeal was argued. Of  
the two cases of appeal tried, the evi-  
dence in one was "clearly insufficient,"  
and the action of the police court was  
properly reversed; the other case is  
the one to which you evidently refer  
when you say in your "reply" that it  
was "the one deemed the strongest,"  
and that it "was declared by the jury  
to be not guilty." We are sorry to  
be "not guilty" in this case was clear  
and sufficient against the party, and  
the decision of the police court should  
have been sustained. The upper court  
is of the same opinion, and, in the  
time in which your career, the  
judge of that court "lectured a jury for  
the verdict rendered."

This is the only case, however, in  
which you can claim justice was not  
done you in the criminal court. We do  
not understand, therefore, the assertion  
in your "reply" that "in many other in-  
stances of cases appealed from the de-  
cision of police court, where the evi-  
dence seemed to be against the party,  
the upper court did not sustain the  
city's case." The judge of that court  
informs us that only these two cases  
have ever been before that court, dur-  
ing your administration, and, an appeal  
from the decision of the police court.

Now, we submit this question: Is not  
this a slim basis on which to form the  
conviction, to which you say you ar-  
rived, viz., that "public sentiment is not  
in favor of extending the reforms."  
We ask, is this a slim basis for the  
reason that if you will remember your  
oaths of office, there is nothing said in  
them as to whether you are to have an  
option of withholding the discharge of  
your duty until the supreme court, or  
the results that may follow upon an  
appeal. If every case of appeal were  
to be reversed in the upper court, we  
submit that does not relieve the police  
court in the premises, and does not  
affect the discharge of your duty in the  
least. For if your position be a correct  
one, it would involve every inferior  
court in West Virginia from adminis-  
trating the law in view of the possi-  
bility of an appeal to the supreme court,  
even in the darkest days in the  
jurisprudence of England, ever  
had as broad a distinction as that.

Therefore, we cannot agree with you  
that your experience in these ap-  
peals is a conclusive proof that  
"public sentiment, as expressed  
through the jury box, is not in favor of  
the enforcement" of "present laws."  
Under other administrations, any such  
ground for complaint; neither was such  
complaint ever made. In any case, we  
believe the police court in our solemn  
obligation to perform its duty, what-  
ever may be the consequences of an  
appeal in the upper court.

2.—The failure to secure justice, in  
council, before the committee on pe-  
titions and remonstrances.

You state that you appeared before  
said committee, and entered objection  
to the issuance of licenses to persons  
who had not been previously present at  
the ordinance as expressed in section 18,  
of the ordinances in relation to coffee  
houses and ordinaries. We find that  
section imposes a fine upon any person  
keeping a coffee house or ordinary who  
has not been present at the ordinance  
to which he "shall suffer any rioting  
or drunkenness, or any public lewd-  
ness or obscenity," etc., at his place.

The records of the committee on pe-  
titions and remonstrances show that, on  
April 1, 1899, the mayor and chief of  
police did appear before said commit-  
tee, and did protest against the issue-  
ance of a license to two parties. The  
records of council, however, do not  
show that they had been previously  
present at the ordinance, and, at that  
same committee meeting, April 10, there  
were written protests and petitions of  
other parties against another place. These  
written documents were carried to the  
committee's report into council, and,  
having considered them in open ses-  
sion, council refused to license that  
place.

Now we are at a loss to know why the  
mayor and chief of police, who began  
so well, did not persevere and press  
their case before council as a body.  
Why give such undue weight, in your  
"reply," to the point made by the com-  
mittee on petitions and remonstrances,  
that "if applicants were refused, the  
revenues of the city would be reduced?"  
Why should that have alienated all  
official obligation, if, "acting upon the  
advice of competent counsel," as you  
state, you had seen in it "a strike at  
the root of the condition?" Would the  
cutting off of the licenses of two viola-  
tors of the law have bankrupted the  
city financially? The facts are, leading  
members of council inform us that  
that until recently, did they know that  
the mayor and chief of police had ever  
made any such protest. Again, we  
ask, why was not that protest made by  
council, and a hearing demanded? The  
mayor and chief had full liberty to  
do so; and, had they done so, unques-  
tionably their defense at this time  
would not be so utterly groundless,  
when they assume to state that "acting  
upon the advice of competent counsel" they

determined "to strike at the root of  
the condition."

3.—The question of revenue.

In your "reply" you make the asser-  
tion that "the police department was  
last year required to produce \$7,000  
from fines and fees in police court, a  
requirement surely not calculated to  
improve the moral welfare of the city."  
Permit us to call your attention espe-  
cially to the strong words used, "re-  
quired" and "requirement." Now we  
submit such is not the financial "poli-  
cy" of the city. There is no such "re-  
quirement." Never has been.

At the beginning of the fiscal year  
the joint standing committee on finance  
is in the habit of estimating the prob-  
able revenues of the city. It makes up  
the estimate from the income from  
various sources of revenue of the pre-  
vious years. The matter of fines and  
fees is not a "required" fixed amount,  
as you would have us believe. Fur-  
thermore, these fines and fees are not  
devoted to the regulation, running ex-  
penses of the city. They do not go to  
the expenses of the police department;  
neither are they included in the esti-  
mated running expenses of any other  
department. They are, by act of the  
legislature, turned over to the board of  
public works for improvements. Mem-  
bers of council, whom we have advised  
with—and we have consulted leading  
members of the joint standing commit-  
tee on finance—repute the idea that  
the city's policy is to raise revenue  
from "offenders of the class of which"  
we "complain," much less that "it is a  
part of the present financial structure  
of the city," as you assert. And know-  
ing what you do now, since your "re-  
ply" was printed, we prophesy you  
would not again fall into any such  
blunders at the expense of our city's  
reputation, both abroad and at home.

In conclusion, we would remind you  
that, on entering upon the duties of  
your respective offices, the way was  
clear for practical reform in this mat-  
ter of the slot machine. Ex-Mayor  
Butts had stopped them as one of his  
last official acts. Why were they not  
allowed to return again? Not only  
have they returned, but, as your re-  
cent raid for revenue proves, they have  
returned in greatly increased numbers.  
Furthermore, slot machines, like the  
class exhibiting the most obscene pic-  
tures, have come in very recently,  
which are violations of section 5, of  
"Offenses," which provides that it is  
unlawful for any person to publicly  
exhibit or cause to be exhibited, en-  
graving, print, sculpture, picture or  
representation within this city. And yet  
the violation of this ordinance is per-  
mitted daily by the operation of these  
obscene slot machines. Has this law  
been "declared unconstitutional" also?

Once more, therefore, we call upon  
you to perform your duties in the  
matter complained of in our former  
petition. We came to you, with  
the prayer only that you "en-  
force the law for the suppression of all  
slot machines in our city," and that you  
"take measures forthwith for  
granting the prayer of this petition."  
The upper court, in the case of the  
upper court, and six were dismis-  
sed before the appeal was argued. Of  
the two cases of appeal tried, the evi-  
dence in one was "clearly insufficient,"  
and the action of the police court was  
properly reversed; the other case is  
the one to which you evidently refer  
when you say in your "reply" that it  
was "the one deemed the strongest,"  
and that it "was declared by the jury  
to be not guilty." We are sorry to  
be "not guilty" in this case was clear  
and sufficient against the party, and  
the decision of the police court should  
have been sustained. The upper court  
is of the same opinion, and, in the  
time in which your career, the  
judge of that court "lectured a jury for  
the verdict rendered."

## FOOT BALL. BOWLING. Sporting. BOXING. CYCLING.

BOLEN A SURPRISE

To McClelland in Their Bout, Which  
Went the Limit, and Was Declared  
a Draw—Bolen Did All the Leading.

Jack McClelland's aspirations for  
higher honors in the featherweight  
ranks got a decided set-back last night  
in his bout at the Metropolitan club  
with Sam Bolen, which went the twenty-  
round limit and was decided a draw  
by Referee Oscar Gardner. At the  
start, McClelland was a 10 to 6 choice,  
and with him and his friends it was  
only a question of how long Bolen  
would stay. But Bolen fooled them and  
it was a question rather, if he shouldn't  
have gotten the decision.

In the judgment of the generous and  
impartial Gardner, the draw was  
proper. Bolen had most of the crowd  
with him for two reasons, namely that  
the prejudice against certain Pitts-  
burgh sports here tended to make him  
representative of it, and because he  
was the aggressor throughout. As  
against the latter feature, McClelland  
people claim that Bolen missed a dozen  
times to once he landed. He had a  
shade the better of it, which seemed  
more apparent because Wheeling  
crowds always saw McClelland appear  
to more advantage in previous engage-  
ments. His style changed last night  
from his long left jabs and clean blocks  
to that of ducking and backing away.  
He didn't care to mix much. Under  
the clean break rule he might have  
done better.

He was well satisfied with a draw as  
he had reason to be. He was greatly  
disappointed at not being able to defeat  
Bolen. He ran up against a different  
proposition to what he ever figured on.  
No matter how he explains it, the fact  
remains that McClelland's glory was  
sadly dimmed. He couldn't do any-  
thing with Bolen, and his cleverness  
was all called in play to save being de-  
cisively trimmed. The crowd was  
large and Bolen's friends believed he  
earned the decision. McClelland's were  
glad their money was saved. It was a  
fast battle all the way.

The preliminary went only four  
rounds, Walter Burgo easily distancing  
Pete Davis, the local colored boxer.  
It was to have gone six rounds, but  
Davis couldn't go further. He was  
badly punished.

Before the main bout commenced,  
Announcer Murphy read a telegram  
from Eddie Santy, of Chicago, to Oscar  
Gardner, challenging the winner.  
In McClelland's corner were his man-  
ager, Billy Corcoran, Otto Black and Bill  
Bradburn, the old time fighter, of Pitts-  
burgh, and Bolen's seconds were  
Hughey Arnold, Iye Neiminger and Sid  
Sadler. The audience took with small  
grace the announcement that the crowd  
had agreed to break clean. There was  
a regular storm of hisses which pre-  
valled a long time.

Manager Corcoran, who had insisted  
on this clean break, then consisted  
with Oscar Gardner, who the crowd  
yelled "call it off." The unpopular re-  
ception clean break received failed to  
make Corcoran change his mind.  
Then Announcer Murphy told the crowd  
it took two to make a clinch and that  
one man could punch if he liked. This  
sort of perturbed the excited Corcoran.  
A second later, Murphy announced that  
Corcoran agreed to straight Queens-  
bury rules and the audience was satis-  
fied.

Both men stripped well. Bolen land-  
ed nicely on Jack after fiddling and  
showed up well in an exchange. Bolen  
was the aggressor, but little damage  
was done. Jack took matters cool and  
got away easily from Sam's swings.  
Jack dove in for a good stomach jolt  
in the second. They mixed it in a cor-  
ner, Jack clinching out of it. Sam  
rushed and Jack stopped him with left  
on jaw, sending Bolen to the floor. He  
was up quickly. They sparred until  
the gong.

Jack was forced to clinch frequently  
in the third round and Sam upper cut  
him nicely when he ducked. Jack  
landed a heavy blow on Sam's stomach  
early in the round, fell short.

Bolen rushed Jack in the next and  
he ran him around the ring. The shift-  
y Pittsburgher evaded some of Sam's  
smashes, but was given lots of pun-  
ishment, especially on the back, when  
he ducked. This was Bolen's round in  
great style.

Jack attempted to cut loose in the  
fifth and they fought mostly at  
range. Bolen and great Bolen swung  
and led only to go wild or fall short,  
and he seemed to do better in a clinch,  
when he swung around Jack's back.  
Toward the close, Jack shot a swift  
hook to the jaw that toppled Bolen  
over. He was up instantly. It was nice  
work.

The next opened in a clinch and Jack  
protested against Bolen striking with  
one arm free. Sam chopped him nicely  
on the face. Jack had to hug often and  
once he slipped to the floor. Sam was  
urged to go after him and he made a  
hot try. He staggered Jack with a left  
chop on neck as the round closed. The  
work excited Bolen's admirers.

Jack rushed Sam as they came from  
their corners and planted a hard left on  
jaw. He followed with beauties for the  
stomach and got Sam on the go. Sam  
checked him with upper cuts, but this  
round was McClelland's clear and  
strong.

Bolen assumed the defensive in the  
eighth. In a mix Jack dropped in his  
own corner. Jack was after Sam's  
stomach and found it with a couple of  
other punches. Sam managed to upper  
cut to advantage. Jack's fast foot-  
work caused many of Bolen's swings to  
carve the air.

Sam tried the aggressive again in the  
ninth and Jack countered hard right on  
the ribs, and he sent in slingers with  
both hands in the exchange. Occasion-  
ally Sam lifted a handy right upper on  
the jaw, but he failed to take advan-  
tage of easy chances when they clinch-  
ed.

The tenth showed no let-up in the  
fast fighting that began with the first  
round and was the most exciting.  
Both were tired at its close. McClelland  
looking a trifle worried. He was faster  
than Bolen, and Sam was cleaner and  
he was fresh as a daisy in the  
eleventh. While Sam lacked steam his  
rusher tired Jack. The thirteenth was  
conspicuous for more of Sam's slaps on  
Jack's back in clinches. As in  
other rounds, Jack started the four-  
teenth with a rush, but Bolen stayed  
with him and he had to again resort to  
ducking and clinches.

It looked like a finish alternately for  
each, but Sam chopped head and back  
in the clinch and upper cut him. The  
best Jack did was short arm punches  
that had considerable steam. He was  
after a grand stand finish, but Bolen  
wouldn't let him, and was chasing him  
at the close.

Kennedy's Matches.

James "Reddy" Mason, manager of  
Eddie Kennedy, was among the Pitts-  
burgh delegation at the McClelland-  
Bolen contest. To the Intelligencer  
man, he stated that Kennedy was  
matched to meet Philadelphia Tommy  
Ryan, at Niles, O., on January 13; Chi-  
cago Jack Day, in Wheeling, Febru-  
ary 5, and George McPadden, of the  
Hercules club, New York, the date to  
be set later.

Y. M. C. A. League.

The Midgits took two games from the  
Premos Wednesday evening. Scores:

Premos..... 1st 2d 3d Total  
Rader..... 150 109 208 123  
Cardona..... 100 145 157 402  
Liggett..... 129 156 139 424  
Campbell..... 101 167 91 459  
Blind..... 124 128 157 409

Totals..... 741 799 838 2333

Midgits..... 1st 2d 3d Total  
Schott..... 142 140 167 449  
Liggett..... 129 156 139 424  
Marl..... 143 148 145 436  
Dinger..... 130 221 118 469  
Blind..... 130 139 157 426

Totals..... 707 838 745 2290

Musée League.